

REMARKS

The Office Action of January 9, 2004, has been reviewed, and in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims pending in the application are respectfully requested. New claims 47 and 48 have been added to further clarify the inventive aspects of the present inventions. Applicants believe that the combination of claim limitations as recited are not disclosed or taught by any of the cited references, alone or in combination. Reconsideration is therefore earnestly requested. No new matter is added with the new claims.

Specification

The Office Action has requested correction of the preliminary amendment. Applicants respectfully point out that the application entitled "System and Method for Managing a Component-Based System" has been assigned serial number 09/749,940. The serial numbers for the remaining co-pending applications have been included through this amendment.

The Office Action has objected to the title requesting that a new title without the terms "System and Method" are needed. The title has now been changed to "Flexible Network Service Application Components."

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-46 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on a public use or sale by Template Software Corporation's commercial product SNAP 8.0, released in 1997. More specifically, the Office Action relies upon the "Using the SNAP Development Environment"

manual (hereinafter "SNAP reference").

Chapter 5 of the SNAP reference discusses the Shared Information Base (SIB) facilities that supports interprocess communication. SIB facilities are used to share classes among the processes in an application. The SIB Connection Editor is used to define communications connections between processes. As stated on 5-4 of the SNAP reference, a SIB connection is the mechanism through which two processes communicate using the TCP/IP communication protocol. The communicating processes connect to share data in the form of classes.

For a proper rejection under 102(b), each and every limitation of the claims must be shown in a single reference. The SNAP reference fails to show each and every limitation as claimed by Applicants. Therefore, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

The SNAP reference fails to show an application component comprising a combination of context, façade and event portal wherein a service is managed as an independent entity. For example, the SNAP reference fails to disclose a façade for containing context-independent service logic wherein the façade is not associated with the service session. This limitation is completely missing from the SNAP reference. Rather, the SNAP reference appears to be concerned with a SIB connection through which two processes communicate using the TCP/IP communication protocol. The Office Action states that the SNAP reference discloses an ability to create a object oriented template but fails to show how the SNAP reference discloses a façade for containing context-independent service logic wherein the façade is not associated with the service session. As the SNAP reference fails to disclose at least this limitation, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. In addition, the SNAP reference fails to further disclose the context for containing logic and data associated with a service session and an event portal for

providing entry and exit interfaces. These limitations are recited in independent claims 1 and 24.

Dependent claims 2-23 and 25-46 further recite additional features that are not disclosed in the SNAP reference. For instance, the SNAP reference fails to disclose the wiring tool, as recited by Applicants. The SNAP reference also fails to show the network independence and protocol independence feature, claimed by Applicants. Rather, the SNAP reference is dependent on the TCP/IP communication protocol. The specific limitations directed to the context are also missing from the SNAP reference.

New claims 47 and 48 have been added to further clarify the novel features of the invention. Claim 47 recites *“a context for containing logic and state data associated with a transaction, the context having a plurality of variants wherein each context variant is associated with a specific transaction;”* *“a façade for containing context-independent service logic wherein the façade is not associated with the transaction wherein the façade instantiates a plurality of context variants depending on configuration data;”* and *“an event portal for providing entry and exit interfaces for the application component wherein the event portal sends and receives at least one event for the transaction wherein the at least one event comprises an object used to communicate details of an occurrence;”* *“wherein the façade processes the event for the transaction and invokes a specific context variant of the plurality of context variants and adds the specific context variant to a context envelope for establishing a transaction specific communication path,”* and *“wherein the application component is protocol independent and network independent.”* Claim 48 includes similar corresponding limitations.

The SNAP reference fails to disclose the claimed combination of limitations. In addition, there is no proper motivation for modifying the SNAP reference to include the missing

Appl. No.: 09/749,938
Amdt. dated April 8, 2004
Reply to Office action of January 9, 2004

limitations. As discussed above, there are clear differences between the present invention and the SNAP reference. The cited references fail to show, teach or make obvious the invention as claimed by Applicants. For at least the reasons presented above, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that prosecution and allowance of the application will be expedited through an interview, whether personal or telephonic, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned with any suggestions leading to the favorable disposition of the application.

It is believed that no fees are due for filing this Response. However, the Director is hereby authorized to treat any current or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time for its timely submission as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. Applicants also authorize the Director to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.17, or all required extension of time fees, to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Respectfully submitted,

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP

Date: April 8, 2004

By: 
Yisun Song
Registration No. 44,487 for
Thomas E. Anderson
Registration No. 37,063

Hunton & Williams LLP
1900 K Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109
(202) 955-1966